

MINUTES  
April 11, 2012

PRE-MEETING CONFERENCE

A pre-meeting conference of the Planning Board was called to order by Chairman Mr. David Manders at 6:45 PM in the Fourth Floor Conference Room of City Hall. Present were:

Maria Perez  
David Pickett  
James Kubiak  
Stephen Plevins  
Michael Pantalone  
Susanne Morello  
John Casadia  
Douglas Albrecht  
David Manders

Members not present:  
Victor Terenik  
Mayor Robert Romano

Also present were:

Frank DiDomenico, Planning Board Solicitor  
Yasmin Ricketts, Planning Board Secretary  
Brian Myers, City Engineer  
Kathleen Hicks, Supervising Planner  
Stephen Hawk, Senior Planner  
Daniel Cabral, Principal Engineer

Public notice pursuant to the Open Public Meetings Act was given on December 31, 2011 by posting written notice on the Official Bulletin Board in City Hall, and mailing written notices to the Daily Journal, the Press, the City Clerk and the Board members.

Michael Brosh - Located at the northeasterly southerly side of Sherman Avenue and northerly side of Butler Avenue, Block 7401, Lot 14, Project #12-1273, resubdivision approval to convey a portion of one lot to another lot with variances for lot area, amount of sheds and size of shed.

Mr. Hawk explained that at the direction of the Planning Board, the Planning Division was to meet with Mr. Brosh to go over what was allowed to be stored on his property. Mr. Brosh came to an understanding that he has to make an application for the Zoning Board of Adjustment. A contractor's yard is not a permitted use. He will go before the board to dismiss his application.

Sherman Donuts, Inc. - Located at the easterly side of Delsea Drive south of Sherman Avenue, Block 7002, Lot 50, Project #12-1277, Major Site Plan preliminary/final approval to construct a 2,054 square foot, 36 seat (24 interior seats and 12 exterior seats) fast food restaurant with a 240 square foot walk-in freezer/cooler (Phase 1) and a 7,000 square foot retail building (Phase 2).

Mr. Hawk explained that the property is currently wooded with one house and a couple of outbuildings. The house is in disrepair, and the property is pretty deep. They are proposing the Dunkin Donuts in the front, and a retail building in the rear. The project is broken up into two phases. Phase one will be the construction of the Dunkin Donuts building, and all the site improvements. Phase two will end up being the completion of the retail building. There are some variances associated with signs. The freestanding sign is 70 square feet vs. 75 square feet, a very minimal variance. The applicant has sent a letter revising the sign variances for the walls. The front façade will face Delsea Drive. It slightly comes over the roof line, so a portion of the roof line is a variance. It should be 20 square feet more or less. They want to keep that sign and opt to eliminate two small signs on the awnings. The Dunkin Donuts coffee cup and graphic is a sign. It is 136 square feet of the 198 total. They have elected to eliminate the "DD", so the 34.7 % is reduced down to 33%.

Ms. Hicks explained that we do not allow roof signs. They said it was the new prototype for Dunkin Donuts. She did go online and saw another building that had the same sign.

Mr. Hawk explained the front façade and the variance 33% vs. 10%. The north face of the building is the drive thru side. The side on that side is a variance because our ordinance does not allow any signs on the sides. It is 22 square feet vs. 0 square feet permitted. The southerly side has two signs over the door. There is a sign on each awning and a painting with people on that side. The applicant is going to eliminate some signs and keep the artwork. That drops the square footage down from 114.25 to 90.

Mr. Pickett wanted to know if there was a sign on the side wall.

Mr. Hawk explained that signs are not permitted on the side wall.

Ms. Hicks explained to keep in mind that the three sides are all variances.

Ms. Morello wanted to know about the free standing sign.

Mr. Hawk explained that there is a free standing sign out by the road. That sign has more room for four tenant spaces below it. There may be tenant 1-4 tenants in the back building. It is a pylon sign, and they are proposing 76 square feet. The site itself does not have variances, just design waivers. The drive thru lane and the bypass lane are 10' vs. 12'. The end islands are supposed to be 10' wide, but in order to fit in as many parking spaces as possible, they elected to make them 6.5' wide for two of them. Three of them will be 6.8' wide, and one 8' wide. The storm water management basin in the rear has a posted rail type fence with mesh, 3.75' high vs. 6' required.

Ms. Morello stated that there are required 51 parking spaces but they have 55 spaces.

Mr. Hawk explained that they could eliminate two spaces and with each space they pick up 10'. They could make those islands bigger with eliminating two spaces.

Mr. Pantalione stated that they might not want to reduce the parking, because they do not know what is going into the rear commercial building.

Mr. Hawk explained that the board needs to establish the value of the islands. They are proposing shade trees. Are they going to fit within those islands at their mature sizes? The board has to weigh that versus the value of the parking.

Ms. Morello stated that depending on what is in the back, delivery trucks are another concern.

Mr. Hawk explained the designated delivery area through the site on the plan. It does depend on the rear of the site. The type of stores is unknown at this time.

Mr. Hawk introduced Dan Cabral, Traffic Engineer.

Mr. Hawk explained that the applicant will be seeking a design waiver for the shape of the storm water management basin in the front yard.

Mr. Pickett stated that the basin could be in the front because of elevation.

Mr. Hawk stated that five bicycle parking spaces are required, and they have provided three. They are short two spaces. Item 8, drive thru should be screen from the road. They are just about fully screened, because there are evergreens along the basin and along the edge. Some relief is required because it is not fully screened.

Mr. Pickett wanted to know if more screening would be more trees or a fence.

Mr. Hawk explained that it would be more trees because you cannot have a fence in that basin. They will provide a concrete apron, and the handicapped parking is acceptable as submitted.

Mr. Myers explained that the back basin had a test pit performed, and that they want to see another one. The permeability is questionable.

Mr. Cabral wanted to know if the trees would cover the signs on the building at mature height.

Mr. Hawk went over the types of trees proposed on the site plan.

Mr. Casadia wanted to know if the site will be cemented.

Mr. Hawk explained that the asphalt paving was proposed for the parking area.

B & B Properties of Vineland, LLC - Located at the southerly side of Landis Avenue between Orchard Road and Moyer Street, Block 3503, Lots 5, 6, 48, 49, 50, Project #12-1280, major site plan preliminary/final approval to construct an 86,942 square foot retail building, with a 1,280 square foot vestibule, a 1,367 square foot attached canopy, a 992 square foot attached canopy, two separate 288 square foot attached canopies, a 1,096 square foot attached covered concrete pad, a 382 square foot attached covered delivery dock and a 433 square foot attached covered concrete pad.

Mr. Hawk explained that the application is for a Shop Rite owned by the Bottino family. It is on the former U-Pull It site, and the plan is reviewed before the B-4 zone and Redevelopment District. 70% of the site will be covered. The site goes up hill from Landis Avenue up to the back. There will be two basins excavated down to where the water can flow into them. The truck area is in the rear. The parking will reach Landis Avenue with some islands and landscaping. There is a main driveway directly across from the Capitol Bank driveway. There is a traffic light being proposed with ingress, egress, and multiple lanes. The ingress movement is wider with a bike lane. There is a pedestrian sidewalk down Landis Avenue into the site. There are crosswalks going down the islands in between the parking.

Mr. Pantalione wanted to know if the traffic lights on Landis Avenue would be synchronized with the traffic light at Shop Rite.

Mr. Cabral explained that they should all be synchronized.

Mr. Hawk explained that the Walmart traffic light is approximately 700' from the proposed traffic light. There is an area for a possible pad site for potential development. They are seeking a "C" variance for the impervious lot coverage that includes that pad site. They want to know if the board is willing to grant a 70% impervious lot coverage that includes the Shop Rite and includes a pad site of an unknown design. Comment 6 are specific provisions in the U-Pull it redevelopment district that the plan was reviewed on. Items A, C, G, I, J are met by this plan. Engineering is reviewing items E and F. They said that item F, the bike lanes and sidewalks are okay.

Mr. Myers explained that the Engineering Department has a comment on item E. Item E, in comment 42, prior to perfected plan it will be straightened out.

Mr. Hawk explained that his comments A and B under item 6, deal with provision B and provision K. K is met because they are going to provide the bus stop signs. They do not have to actually have the CATS sign and Landis Avenue shuttle. There is going to be a small indentation in the asphalt that will allow an area for a bus to pull over. 6A is provision B, enhanced landscaping and design requirements. They did provide additional plantings in that intersection at the entrance. They are short on the shade tree requirement for the parking area.

Ms. Hicks wanted this area to be discussed at the hearing, because there is a question regarding the placement of the landscaping.

Mr. Albrecht wanted to know if the placement of the trees was explained to them.

Ms. Hicks stated that it was brought up several times. The placement of the trees breaks up the asphalt and softens the appearance of the site. There is underground drainage but that does not mean that they cannot have the trees.

Mr. Hawk explained that there is an underground storage system for storm water. They are plastic arches that create an opening for water.

Mr. Myers explained that some of the site goes back to the basins, and the overflow of those basins come up and go through the chambers. Most of the parking field will go directly into the chambers.

Mr. Hawk explained that there is a sign variance 165' vs. 135'. The sign height will be met. Item 8A, is related to the lack of tree island breaks. Our ordinance does not allow you to go past twelve rows without a tree island. They have bicycle parking spaces, 20 vs. 46 required. The basin fence is a post and rail type fence, 3.75 vs. 6' required. They do not have a problem meeting the 6' required, and it is not a bad idea because they are close to a residential area. There may be a situation where the applicant meets for the adjacency of that septic system on the Rental City property. Rental City is approximately 12' away from the property line. Their septic system is between their building and the property line. It came up late in the review. The B & B Properties proposed basin "c" is in violation of the city's standard that requires you to be 50' away from a septic system. They can design around that or completely eliminate that basin and incorporate the storage that they are losing into the underground system.

#### REGULAR MEETING

The regular meeting of the Planning Board was called to order by Chairman David Manders, at 7:30 PM in City Council Chambers in City Hall.

Present were:

James Kubiak  
Stephen Plevins  
Michael Pantalone  
Susanne Morello  
John Casadia  
Maria Perez  
David Pickett  
Douglas Albrecht  
David Manders

Absent were: Victor Terenik, Mayor Robert Romano

Also present were:

Frank DiDomenico, Planning Board Solicitor  
Yasmin Ricketts, Planning Board Secretary  
Brian Myers, City Engineer  
Daniel Cabral, Principal Engineer  
Kathleen M. Hicks, Supervising Planner  
Stephen Hawk, Senior Planner

#### FLAG SALUTE

Public notice pursuant to the Open Public Meetings Act was given on December 31, 2011 by posting written notice on the Official Bulletin Board in City Hall, and mailing written notices to the Daily Journal, City Clerk, and the Board members.

MINUTES – Approval of minutes from the March 14, 2012 board meeting.

The Chairman Mr. Manders made a motion to approve the minutes. Roll call:

Mr. Kubiak: Abstain  
Mr. Plevins: Yes  
Mr. Pantalione: Yes  
Ms. Morello: Yes  
Mr. Casadia: Yes  
Ms. Perez: Abstain  
Mr. Pickett: Yes  
Mr. Albrecht: Yes  
Mr. Manders: Yes

RESOLUTIONS – Approval of resolutions from the March 14, 2012 board meeting.

The Chairman Mr. Manders entertained a motion to approve the resolutions. Roll call:

#5997-  
Mr. Plevins: Yes  
Mr. Pantalione: Yes  
Ms. Morello: Abstain  
Mr. Casadia: Yes  
Ms. Perez: Abstain  
Mr. Pickett: Yes  
Mr. Kubiak: Abstain  
Mr. Albrecht: Yes  
Mr. Manders: Yes

#5998-  
Mr. Pantalione: Yes  
Ms. Morello: Yes  
Mr. Casadia: Yes  
Ms. Perez: Abstain  
Mr. Pickett: Yes  
Mr. Kubiak: Abstain  
Mr. Plevins: Yes  
Mr. Albrecht: Yes  
Mr. Manders: Yes

#5999-  
Ms. Morello: Yes  
Mr. Casadia: Yes  
Ms. Perez: Abstain  
Mr. Pickett: Yes  
Mr. Kubiak: Abstain  
Mr. Plevins: Yes  
Mr. Pantalione: Yes  
Mr. Albrecht: Yes  
Mr. Manders: Yes

#6000-  
Mr. Casadia: Yes  
Ms. Perez: Abstain  
Mr. Pickett: Yes  
Mr. Kubiak: Abstain  
Mr. Plevins: Yes  
Mr. Pantalione: Yes  
Ms. Morello: Yes  
Mr. Albrecht: Yes  
Mr. Manders: Yes

The Board's professional staff, Kathleen M. Hicks-Supervising Planner, Stephen Hawk-Senior Planner, and Brian Myers- City Engineer were sworn in.

Chairman David Manders made a motion to open the public hearing. Roll Call:

Ms. Perez: Yes  
Mr. Pickett: Yes  
Mr. Kubiak: Yes  
Mr. Plevins: Yes  
Mr. Pantalione: Yes  
Ms. Morello: Yes  
Mr. Casadia: Yes

Mr. Albrecht: Yes  
Mr. Manders: Yes

#### PUBLIC HEARING

1. Michael Brosh - Located at the northeasterly southerly side of Sherman Avenue and northerly side of Butler Avenue, Block 7401, Lot 14, Project #12-1273, resubdivision approval to convey a portion of one lot to another lot with variances for lot area, amount of sheds and size of shed.

Mr. Brosh testified on his own behalf and asked to have his application dismissed. He re-evaluated the situation and will take his application to the Zoning Board of Adjustment.

Mr. DiDomenico explained that he rendered an opinion that the Planning Board did not have to jurisdiction to hear this application for resubdivision because there was a pre-existing non-conforming contractor's yard on one of the properties. It would constitute an expansion of that use and only Zoning Board would have that jurisdiction.

The Chair entertained a motion to close the public hearing. Ms. Perez so moved, Mr. Pickett seconded. Roll Call:

Mr. Pickett: Yes  
Mr. Kubiak: Yes  
Mr. Plevins: Yes  
Mr. Pantalione: Yes  
Ms. Morello: Yes  
Mr. Casadia: Yes  
Ms. Perez: Yes  
Mr. Albrecht: Yes  
Mr. Manders: Yes

The Chair entertained to dismiss the application. Ms. Perez so moved, Mr. Pickett seconded. Roll Call:

Mr. Kubiak: Yes  
Mr. Plevins: Yes  
Mr. Pantalione: Yes  
Ms. Morello: Yes  
Mr. Casadia: Yes  
Ms. Perez: Yes  
Mr. Pickett: Yes  
Mr. Albrecht: Yes  
Mr. Manders: Yes

2. Landis Square Phase IV - Located southeasterly corner of Landis Avenue and East Avenue and southwesterly corner of Landis Avenue and Myrtle Street, Block 4201, Lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 53. The applicant was represented by Todd Heck, Esq. They requested an amendment to a resolution #5862 previously granted in March 2009. Mr. Lampart is the city's redeveloper under the city's redevelopment plan for the Four Corners Landis Square. The only thing that will be changing is that they are proposing to increase the number of two bedroom units in the residential portion of the facility, and decrease the total number of units from 78 to 68. There will be twenty four two bedroom units. This does not require an expansion of the previously granted approval.

Mr. Hans Lampart, Developer, testified on behalf of the applicant. They are trying to provide a more competitive application this year to the FHMA, allocator of the tax credits. The biggest problem has been the cost of the land burdening the number of units. The project has not been successful for the last three cycles because the project cost dividing the number of units. This year the program was changed based on the number of bedrooms. Everything is the same, just reconfiguring the inside. Out of the 24 units, 8 to 12 of them will be reserved for special needs applicants.

Mr. Heck explained that HMFA is the New Jersey Mortgage and Finance Agency and about the program. Mr. Lampart had had to apply and compete with other applicants throughout the state to try to get project credit financing.

Mr. Lampart explained that the footprint will remain the same, and just the interior of the buildings will be modified. The building elevations will also remain the same.

Mr. Hawk wanted to know if there was still a mix of age restricted units.

Mr. Lampart stated that it was still going to be the same.

Mr. Myers explained that when the applicant is ready for the perfected plan, there is a shift with accessibility guides. It used to be American Disability Act Accessibility guide, and there are changing

some things. The Public Right of way Accessibility guide is included, and during review the Engineering Division will be looking at the right of way area in according to the RROWAG.

Ms. Hicks explained that when the perfected plan is submitted, all the pages need to reflect what the project is now proposed to be.

The Chair entertained a motion to close the public hearing. Ms. Perez so moved, Mr. Pickett seconded. Roll Call:

Mr. Kubiak: Yes  
Mr. Plevins: Yes  
Mr. Pantalione: Yes  
Ms. Morello: Yes  
Mr. Casadia: Yes  
Ms. Perez: Yes  
Mr. Pickett: Yes  
Mr. Albrecht: Yes  
Mr. Manders: Yes

The Chair entertained a motion to approve the amendment of the resolution. Ms. Perez so moved, Mr. Pickett seconded. Roll Call:

Mr. Plevins: Yes  
Mr. Pantalione: Yes  
Ms. Morello: Yes  
Mr. Casadia: Yes  
Ms. Perez: Yes  
Mr. Pickett: Yes  
Mr. Kubiak: Yes  
Mr. Albrecht: Yes  
Mr. Manders: Yes

3. Sherman Donuts, LLC - Located at the easterly side of Delsea Drive south of Sherman Avenue, Block 7002, Lot 50, Project #12-1277, Major Site Plan preliminary/final approval to construct a 2,054 square foot, 36 seat (24 interior seats and 12 exterior seats) fast food restaurant with a 240 square foot walk-in freezer/cooler (Phase 1) and a 7,000 square foot retail building (Phase 2).

The applicants were represented by Michael Gruccio, Esq., and he explained that they have received the revised engineering report and planning report. They applicant's professional team has met with the city staff and there were a number of things that have been reached. In terms of the revised engineering report, there are three comments pointed out. One appears in section one of the report, to perform an additional permeability test below the restricted layer of soil. That was completed and the data was sent to the Engineering Division, but they have not had a chance to review it to provide comment on it. There is also a comment in number six of that report, to obtain approval from the NJDOT with regard to discharge of overflow of surface storm water into the storm water inlet within the Delsea Drive right of way. The applicant agrees to that condition. Finally, in section eighteen, an indication is given that the applicant is required to demonstrate a potential connection to an adjacent property to the north. The applicant is willing to revise the plans.

Mr. Hawk wanted to make sure that item 5E was accurate, should be 20 square feet of the 59.4 square foot sign is a roof sign.

Mr. Gruccio explained that the revised sign package submitted by the applicant 5B has been downsized from 34.7% to 33% of front façade coverage. The wall signage on the southerly façade has been downsized to 90 square feet.

Mr. John Pettit, Design Engineer, testified on behalf of the applicant. In the planning report, section 8, drive thru fully screened from a street. The applicant recognizes that the applicant technically does not have full screening from the street. It does not have a 6' high fence, but it has a well designed landscaping package along Delsea Drive. They are meeting the intent of the ordinance with the screening of trees. They are seeking relief for number 7, bicycle parking spaces, seeking. They have added a bicycle rack, and at the retail store. The bicycle racks are exposed, because the bicycles are parked on a temporary basis. Comment 6, regarding the lane width of 12', they are asking for a design waiver for the 10' bypass lane provided. The ordinance requires that the islands at the end of the parking stalls are a minimum of 10' in width. The islands are 6.5', 6.8', to 8'. It was designed that way to maximize the number of parking spaces on the site. The user of the commercial building is unknown, so they wanted to provide more parking. There will be 55 parking spaces proposed vs. 51 parking spaces required. The islands proposed will have top soil and seed. The height of the fence around the basin will be 4' high split rail fence with wire mesh on the outside. The edge of the basin on Delsea is a straight line. They are trying to maximize the volume of that basin. The grading is 1' in depth, with the landscaping, the design has been achieved. The curvilinear design is aesthetic. The application for the water overflow is currently being reviewed by the NJDOT. The signage variances include the 20' pylon sign near the entrance on Delsea Drive 75 square feet vs. 76 square feet. The front elevation, 33% of the front façade for signage vs. 10% is permitted. A portion of it exceeds the height of the building 20 square feet vs. 0 square feet permitted. They southerly side of the building, 90 square feet vs. 0 square feet permitted. The text was eliminated and the "DD". The original submission on the front façade, the text was eliminated on the awnings and the "DD". The northern façade with the drive thru window, 22 square

feet proposed to allow additional identification for Delsea Drive. The mural that is part of the building designs for Dunkin Donuts is a corporate logo. The sign package for the building is attractive and should be acceptable.

Ms. Hicks stated that on item 8, screening for the drive thru, she is not in agreement with there being adequate screening. There are efforts to soften the look, but not comfortable to meeting the intent. She did not oppose what was being proposed. Item 7, bicycle parking, usage is becoming very common. There is a need for accommodations for bicycles. Item 6C, storm, water basin, the split rail is not as effective as a 6' fence. It is back behind the strip store, and 6' is safer. She did research for the signage and it is the new prototype. The north side sign is totally unnecessary. It is the exit to the drive thru and it is redundant to the freestanding sign. There is a lot of abuse of signage, but that is not grounds for approving signs.

Mr. Casadia also had a concern with the fence height around the basin.

Ms. Morello also had a concern with the fence height around the basin.

Mr. Pickett had comments about the basin.

Mr. Pantalione did not have a problem with the site plan.

Mr. Albrecht did not have a problem with the signage or the fence height.

Mr. Pettit explained that the site was laid out to provide the loading area in the southern end of the building. Typically a single large user can enter the property and maneuver in the area. There is also a walk up area for unloading.

Mr. Hawk wants the approval to reflect the trees being okay in the 6.5' area to check it against the perfected plan. In Phase II, the sidewalk associated with the rear building can be done at that time.

The Chair entertained a motion to close the public hearing. Ms. Perez so moved, Mr. Pantalione seconded. Roll Call:

Mr. Pantalione: Yes  
Ms. Morello: Yes  
Mr. Casadia: Yes  
Ms. Perez: Yes  
Mr. Pickett: Yes  
Mr. Kubiak: Yes  
Mr. Plevins: Yes  
Mr. Albrecht: Yes  
Mr. Manders: Yes

The Chair entertained a motion to approve the site plan application. Mr. Pantalione so moved, Mr. Pickett seconded. Roll Call:

Ms. Morello: Yes  
Mr. Casadia: Yes  
Ms. Perez: Yes  
Mr. Pickett: Yes  
Mr. Kubiak: Yes  
Mr. Plevins: Yes  
Mr. Pantalione: Yes  
Mr. Albrecht: Yes  
Mr. Manders: Yes

4. B & B Properties of Vineland, LLC- Located at the southerly side of Landis Avenue between Orchard Road and Moyer Street, Block 3503, Lots 5, 6, 48, 49, 50, Project #12-1280, major site plan preliminary/final approval to construct an 86,942 square foot retail building, with a 1,280 square foot vestibule, a 1, 367 square foot attached canopy, a 992 square foot attached canopy, two separate 288 square foot attached canopies, a 1, 096 square foot attached covered concrete pad, a 382 square foot attached covered delivery dock and a 433 square foot attached covered concrete pad.

The applicant was represented by Damien Del Duca, Esq., The applicant is proposing to relocate to the former U-Pull It site. B & B Properties is the contract purchaser, and the area is in need of redevelopment. It is the B-4 zone and redevelopment area. The applicant is seeking a major site plan preliminary/final approval, 88, 222 square foot building shown at the rear of the property. This includes Shop Rite and some other tenants in the front of the primary building. The tenants are not yet to be determined. There is a pad site on the plan, and there is no tenant yet. It was displayed it to show potential impervious coverage. They are requesting 70% impervious coverage. The size of the freestanding sign, proposing 165 square feet vs. 125 square feet permitted at the entrance. They have agreed to reduce the overall sign height to comply with the ordinance. The applicant has decided to eliminate the proposed storm water basin, and include it with the underground storm water system. The comments E-H have been eliminated in the Planner's Report. They are trying to address any concerns

that anyone will have, and believe it is a clear plan. The applicant does not have any concern with the review letters provided by the city.

Mr. Henry J. Haley, Professional Engineer, the site plans were prepared by his company. The lot is vacant, and they are currently awaiting a no further action notice from the NJDEP. Everything drains towards Landis Avenue, and in the rear there is a substantial slope. There are three lots owned by the city and other residential lots along the rear. To the north, there is a Capitol Bank, east is wooded, and the west is a Rental City. There will be a single access, 2 lanes in, 2 lanes out. A traffic signal will be installed. There will be a looped roadway system around the site. The building is single elevation, and the overall area is balanced. There is a loading area in the rear for the supermarket, and trash disposal area. To the south there are two large basins in the rear, they will carry 100% of overflow as well as all run off and into the underground. There is an extensive parking area, 459 spaces of which 442 is required by ordinance. A trash disposal area will be made for the tenants with masonry walls and mulch surrounding it. There are no sanitary lines in the area, so a pumping station will be installed, a gravity main from the rear of the proposed structure, and a gravity main that will come out the roadway and run along the frontage. It can be extended in the future, and this is under request from LSA. In addition, for adequate water pressure and flow, for fire purposes, an extended water main will be put in from the site to Mill Road. The discharge of the pumping station will go to the rear, and out to Woodlawn Avenue as requested by LSA. The lighting will meet the requirements of the town. The lighting in the entrance way, and along Landis Avenue will be enhanced. In addition, bicycle access will be provided, and bicycle racks will be provided. The sanitary sewer line running in the rear of the property crosses three vacant lots on Woodlawn Avenue owned by the City of Vineland. There will be a 10' easement on either side for water and sewer installation. They are requesting impervious coverage 70% vs. 60% permitted, to have the ability to build onto the pad section of the plan. The plan is consistent with current supermarkets, 672' off of Landis Avenue. The parking is located in the front and some on the side for employees. There is no parking in the rear of the store because of the loading area. There is a row of islands missing. Approximately 10-12 parking spaces would have to be removed to accommodate that island. They want to keep the site open and be seen from the road. There is enhanced landscaping closer towards the road, and an island at the tee section.

Mr. Hawk wanted to make sure the total easement in back is 30' for water and sewer.

Mr. Del Duca explained that there are no objections for the easements.

Ms. Hicks explained that she was concerned about the east side trash enclosure. She wanted to know accessibility for the trash trucks.

Mr. Haley explained that the enclosure would be on an angle and would still be able to collect the trash.

Ms. Hicks explained that there is a new city ordinance for solid waste and recycling. There is mandatory recycling that also has to be provided for. She also wanted to make an announcement to the neighbors in the audience about the rear lots. They are owned by the city and will not be sold to the Bottinos. The city will hold them until this site develops and staff will recommend for them to be sold as homes. As for the pad site, have some control in marketing and have a common design. She would advocate 6' fencing. She also wanted to know where the five additional trees would be placed.

Mr. Haley explained where the trees would be located.

Mr. Jim Bottino, President, testified on behalf of B & B properties. They have been in the supermarket business for 13 years. The current facility is very dated and very inefficient because of the age. The new site will be a state of the art facility and customer friendly. There will be an energy management system put in. There also will be more of a variety of products, and enhanced food service departments. The hours of operation will be Monday through Saturday 7:00am to 11:00pm, Sunday 7:00am to 10:00pm. There will be an estimated 200 employees at the new facility. The parking is satisfactory for the supermarkets needs. The pad site is a critical component to the overall site. The other tenants can only be open when the Shop Rite is open.

Mr. Michael Brown, Traffic Engineer, testified on behalf of the applicant. He took a general look at the location during peak hours at the intersections. The signal on Orchard Road and Landis Avenue, and the signal at the Walmart were analyzed. The driveways at the Capitol Bank and the Walmart were also looked at. The average daily numbers of trips were around 20,000 vehicles per day. The projection will be for about three years. Based on the analysis, there will not be a significant impact. The most desirable location for a signal will be across from the bank. As shown on the roadway plans, the improvements include widening of the road on both sides of Landis Avenue. There will be left turn lanes for the bank, and all the lights will be synchronized with the current lights. There also will be traffic pedestrian push button and cross walks.

William Hipkins, 1287 Woodlawn Avenue, lives directly behind the site. Currently the biggest problem is people parking and trash on the vacant site. He does not want access to the site from his street, and would like to see fencing placed.

Doug Van Meter, Owner of Rental City, was concerned with the traffic. He wanted to know if his frontage would be affected by the widening of the road. Mr. DelDuca explained that it would take place in the city right-of-way. He also wanted to know about the fencing next to his property, and if they are planning to put up a new one. He wanted to know how trash and loitering was going to be prevented from going on



to his property. Mr. DeDuca explained that there is an existing fence that will be removed, and replaced beyond approximately where the garage is located.

Mr. Van Meter wanted to know about the basin being removed.

Mr. Haley explained what was being proposed.

Mr. William Biondi, Woodlawn Avenue, was concerned with the rear fencing.

Ms. Anne Capelli, Woodlawn Avenue, was also concerned with the fencing in the rear.

Mr. Jeffrey Barron, Esq. represented Vineland Construction, and is in favor with the plan that is proposed. They made an agreement that they will extend the stub that is shown on the west side up to the property line. The purpose is for future access if they ever is development.

Mr. Hawk explained that screening can be done by fencing or vegetation.

Mr. Myer explained that street name sign should be eliminated from the plan.

Mr. DeDuca explained that they would be willing to put up a fence if that is the board's preference. They are also willing to work with the neighbors.

Ms. Hicks wanted the residents to know that the applicants accommodating the rear fence is their decision. It is their option to place landscaping screening or 6' fence.

The Chair entertained a motion to close the public hearing. Ms. Perez so moved, Mr. Pickett seconded.  
Roll Call:

Ms. Perez: Yes  
Mr. Pickett: Yes  
Mr. Kubiak: Yes  
Mr. Plevins: Yes  
Mr. Pantalione: Yes  
Ms. Morello: Yes  
Mr. Casadia: Yes  
Mr. Albrecht: Yes  
Mr. Manders: Yes

The Chair entertained a motion to approve the site plan application. Ms. Perez so moved, Mr. Pickett seconded. Roll Call:

Mr. Pickett: Yes  
Mr. Kubiak: Yes  
Mr. Plevins: Yes  
Mr. Pantalione: Yes  
Ms. Morello: Yes  
Mr. Casadia: Yes  
Ms. Perez: Yes  
Mr. Albrecht: Yes  
Mr. Manders: Yes

#### ADJOURNMENT

The Chairman entertained a motion to adjourn. Mr. Pantalione so moved. Mr. Pickett seconded.  
Roll call:

Mr. Kubiak: Yes  
Mr. Plevins: Yes  
Mr. Pantalione: Yes  
Ms. Morello: Yes  
Mr. Casadia: Yes  
Ms. Perez: Yes  
Mr. Pickett: Yes  
Mr. Albrecht: Yes  
Mr. Manders: Yes

TIME: 11:18 PM

Respectfully submitted,

Yasmin Ricketts  
Planning Board Secretary